



Lamar University – M.Ed. in Educational Technology Leadership

Reflections of Course-based Embedded Assignments

Directions: In submitting your Course-based Embedded Assignment located in Appendix I of the Internship Handbook, you are required to complete a reflection of the identified assignments in your course wiki/e-portfolio. These reflections will be used to assist you in completing your EDLD 5388/5370 (*Please note that course number changes in Fall 2010*) Internship comprehensive exam final report. Students should use and cite their textbook references as well as two additional references when writing each reflection. The reflection must consist of statements regarding the knowledge you gained from the assignment and how the assignment helped you master the Technology Facilitator Standard(s) /Indicator(s).

Course Number:	Course Name:	Course-based Embedded Hours (see Appendix I)
EDLD 5344	School Law	Course Reflection:

Description of the Assignment/Performance Tasks (see Appendix I)	Course Reflection:
<p>Note: Reflection at a critical level means writing text that reveals your opinion of the reading or experience, why you hold that opinion, how the experience/assignment/reading could be improved, how you see the reading or experience as consistent or inconsistent with what you have learned so far, implications for the future, etc. Reflection should include more content than just a recitation of facts and you should document your writing with a minimum of 3 references.</p> <p>Self –Assessment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Critically reflect (see note above; not just recitation of facts) upon the knowledge you gained from the assignment. (3 Points) 2. Critically reflect upon the relationship between any new information you gained from the assignment with old information you previously held to be true. (2 Points) 3. How did the relationship between the old and new information you learned 	<p>In reflecting upon the student-management issues discussed in this course, I believe the student-management issues that will be most relevant to me as a school administrator are those related to religion, and those related to equal access of school facilities, by extension, the school website. This course has taught me, the reasons for the disappearance of school prayer and for limiting access to school facilities to only student organizations affiliated with K-12 curriculum.</p> <p>Where religion is concerned: According to Dr. Hopson, (week4,slide5) I should analyze the first situation with the Lemon test, i.e., “Is the practice secular or non –religious in purpose? Is the primary effect of the policy or practice one that advances or inhibits religion? Does the practice create an excessive entanglement between Church and State?” As I consider these questions, I must answer that the practice is religious, it advances religion, and very possibly creates an entanglement between Church and state; however, the meeting (Church before school on important game days) occurs off school grounds, students and their parents voluntarily attend, but students may feel coerced into attendance by their</p>

<p>affect your personal experience with the assignment? (2 Points)</p> <p>Learn as a Learner</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Critically reflect (see note above; not just recitation of facts) upon your approach and strategies used in completing the assignment. (3 Points) 2. Critically reflect upon how you learn as a learner and how you assess your own performance in completing the assignment(s). (2 Points) 3. How did your learning and interaction with colleagues (such as discussion forum, web conferences, wiki and blog participation, etc.) affect the results of your performance? (2 Points) <p>Lifelong Learning Skills</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Critically reflect (see note above; not just recitation of facts) upon what you gained about learning and how you learn that will impact your future learning. (3 Points) 2. How will your past interactions and collaborations with colleagues impact your future learning experiences? (2 Points) 3. As a lifelong learner, what questions or issues challenge you and are worthy of future research or investigation? (2 Points) <p>Additional Criteria</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Content posted to e-Portfolio wiki/blog/Google site (1 Point) 2. Mechanics (1 Point) 3. APA Format (1 Point) 4. Minimum of 3 References (1 Point) <p>(Maximum 25 points)</p>	<p>peers....This practice seems to invite a Lemon Test court case; however, because the meeting occurs off-campus and attendance is voluntary, the church and state entanglement may vanish, unless a student could say they were pressured into attendance by peers, teachers, the community at large.</p> <p>Where Equal Access is concerned: The 4-H club and spurs league are allowed to utilize school facilities for practice and meetings. These organizations are not affiliated with school curriculum. According to Dr. Hopson's week 4 lecture, "a school establishes a limited open forum when they permit one or more non-curriculum related student groups to meet on campus before or after classes." (slide 10). If I understand the EAA correctly, the district is also obligated to allow any other non-curriculum related student organization, even a radical one, to meet in the same facilities. By extension, because the school has allowed a link to the FC Spirit site, a web site created and hosted by student's parents and not affiliated with any curriculum, the district would have to post links to other non-curriculum oriented groups, if a request was made, event to a radical site. In each case, not allowing the new organization to meet on school property or to link from the school web site would be a violation of the Equal Access Act and be prosecutable.</p> <p>Knowing these facts and acting upon the remedies are two different things. In each case, at this time, if a person(s) tried to extricate the school from possible litigation by putting a stop to the practices without a law suit threatening, that person might as well pack their bags and move. These are deeply entrenched traditions in our school community, reflective of the morals and values of the majority of the community. Knowing this information will help me consider each situation and try to devise an alternate solution that will enrich the community in equal or greater measure to the tradition that will be lost.</p> <p>In reflecting upon teacher evaluation and remediation, I reviewed the information contained in the 2005 article, <i>Teacher Evaluation: Principals' Insights and Suggestions for Improvement</i>, published in vol36, No.1 &2, volumes of the Planning and Changing Journal, I have learned that our school district might be a bit behind the times where teacher evaluation and remediation are concerned. The district has a policy for teacher</p>
--	--

	<p>evaluation posted online and follows it. New teachers are evaluated twice a year; seasoned teachers need only complete a pre and post summative evaluation each year. When I first started teaching in 1992, all teachers were required to submit to two evaluations a year. In an effort to streamline the process, the Principal wants me to develop an online survey type tool to speed most of the process up. The article I read was old, so I feel that I need more information on current evaluation expectations around the state. There is also a situation brewing involving a seasoned teacher being “drafted” to teach an advanced course in a closely related field. Conflicting stories are flying about how often and when she is available for tutorials and her willingness to help students with difficult homework. Due to the situation, it is possible that she may not be able to help the students. In my opinion, the principal needs to determine if the teacher is in need of additional course materials, resources, and/or subject matter remediation and provide whatever she needs before parents make a formal complaint. In not making herself available to the students, she may be creating a situation that will provide the angry students and their parents grounds for a suit on the basis that she is “denying access” to course curriculum by not being available when promised and not helping them in class. The situation has been brought to the Principal’s and Superintendent’s attention. As such, they need to act immediately in order not to be liable for indifference and/or neglect that is resulting in students’ denial of access to learning.</p> <p>I am not clear as to whether or not the fact that the teacher was assigned to teach this course in a closely related field, and took the assignment in order to keep her job makes the administrators any more or less responsible for the situation. As budgets become tighter, this situation is liable occur in many districts. Is it really the teacher’s fault they are not a subject expert when they were assigned to teach a course that is not in their field, and were not advised of the fact until the pre-service week before school started when there was no time to seek summer professional development or other employment? In the event a student or group of students were to file suit for denial of access to learning in this course, who should be held accountable? I need to research the accountability issues in these kinds of cases.</p> <p>Another legal topic that will continue to affect every</p>
--	--

	<p>school leader in a variety of aspects of school management over the next few years is No Child Left Behind Legislation. This reflection is limited specifically to the Children’s Internet Protection Act, or CIPA as covered by Dr. Sheryl Abshire in the week 4 video conference lecture for this course. While I have been dealing with the local implementation of CIPA for several years now, applying the required filtering to keep students from unwittingly blundering into inappropriate sites during online research sessions, I have learned during this course that there are new regulatory statutes with which districts must comply. While blocking known pornography, drug and weapons related sites, etc. is expected; new legislation makes it clear that it is not permissible to block the sites of radical political and religious groups in the name of “CIPA.” It turns out these sites enjoy the protections of “Free Access” under the constitution’s first amendment. Additionally, the newest iteration of this legislation requires student education for proper online searching, online behavior, and online security precautions for every student, every year. CIPA regulations also address cyber bullying, (online harassment of classmates, teachers, administrators, and unknown persons.) Students are to be taught about the pitfalls, punishments, and preventative measures to reverse the rising number of cases of Cyber bullying, which, in some cases, has resulted in the death of the victims of this mostly covert crime. In thinking about the previous effort to inform teachers about Cyber bullying, I note they have the materials. Some are rather dry, some are very good. The better ones include online and /or power point presentations appropriate for most grade levels. Teachers need to present this information as a unit to cover during their class. Students will advance from grade to grade, so teachers will be encouraged to customize the material to suit their assignments after the first year.</p> <p>In reflecting upon the IEP and remediation process, I have learned the hierarchy of the legal structure that provides educational protections for students with disabilities. The law presumes that every district will automatically be able to provide resources needed for special populations without taking into consideration the finance structures for districts vary from state to state, district to district and school to school. Property poor districts have a very difficult time meeting the educational needs of the general</p>
--	--

	<p>education population. The Texas Legislature's most recent budgetary actions have left school districts reeling; The technology allotment was rescinded, the budgetary amount cut in half and combined with the textbook allotment. This fund has to stretch to cover a biennium. Specifically, in Falls City, the allotment for the first year was \$32000. For the second year, it will be about \$12000. New textbook and electronic materials adoptions to prepare students for the new STAAR test have eaten up all but \$5000.00 of that allotment. That will not cover the cost of either Microsoft licensing or telecommunications port fees needed to provide teachers and students the platforms and internet access to reach electronic research databases or online curriculum. This at a time when electronic curriculum possibilities are expanding exponentially. In effect, the Texas legislature is guilty of indifference to the needs of not only the state's general education K-12 population, but also to it's special populations who, in many cases rely more heavily on technology tools than their general education peers. Does this willful neglect open the door for legal action against the state? I certainly think it is possible someone may realize there is room for litigation to rectify the devastating effects the legislature's recent funding cuts which run counter to the states's technology initiatives as published in Texas Long Range Plan for Technology. Getting back to my point, if districts do not have the funds to provide for general education students, some additional services can be provided via Title 1: IDEA funding for the special education program. Federal funds that the district might receive are siphoned off by the Goliad Special Ed. co-op who provides psychologists, speech therapists, and ARD professionals. There are not usually funds left over for extra equipment or services, but I can imagine in some districts, that might not be the case. So my question is...is it fair to the general education population in Property Poor school districts for their peers being served under the special programs umbrella to receive technology tools, electronic books, etc. that the district cannot provide to the general population? According to Dr. Mike Hopson, in the first lecture of this course, slide 19, <i>Board of Education v. Rowley (1982)</i>, "A school is only required to provide services that allow special education students to progress academically, not services that maximize their potential." Utilization of Federal funds to provide electronic services and technology tool resources not available to the general</p>
--	---

	<p>education population in effect creates a situation in which the “free appropriate public education” standard has been exceeded for special populations and opens the door to some very interesting legal questions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Has the established bar for what constitutes FAPE been raised nationally to include the provision of electronic services, telecommunications resources, and technology tool resources? 2) Would general education population students have grounds to pursue legal rectification in order to procure resources equal to those being provided to special populations where electronic services, telecommunication resources, and technology tool resources are concerned? 3. My logic: The Texas Legislature commissioned accepted, i.e. approved, and published an extensive study, the Texas Long Range Plan for Technology (TLRPT). It details services and equipment, that should exist in every school. As such, it defines and describes the 21st century classroom, i.e. the services and equipment that should be present in every classroom to meet FAPE for every child. Property poor Districts are at maximum taxing evaluations. In many cases, schools are in buildings built early in the 20th century, with wiring and utility services to match. Recent budget cuts aggravated an already intolerable situation. These districts are in blatant violation of FAPE law and vulnerable to a FAPE lawsuit, especially if Title I: IDEA funds provide services and equipment to meet Federal FAPE guidelines for special populations. If Texas School Finance Law shortcomings are restricting the funds necessary to meet FAPE for general education populations, then districts have a right and obligation to sue the state to reform school finance law to produce funding levels that will enable all districts to meet FAPE guidelines for 21st century classrooms as established in the Texas State Long Range Plan for Technology. 4. The evidence suggests, the Texas Legislature has quietly denounced the Texas Long Range Plan for Technology as a defining document for classrooms of the 21st century. In which case, they may wield FAPE like a shield in an argument along the lines of : ”A school is only required to provide services that allow...students to progress academically, not services that maximize their potential.” It then follows other legislation may follow that will limit Federal funding for special programs to prevent
--	---

	<p>special education resource classrooms from exceeding a district's established general education classroom capabilities. Does either argument hold water?</p> <p>Hopson, M. (2011), <i>Week 4: School Management Issues: Part 1: Religion in Schools</i> retrieved from : https://lamar.epiclms.net/Learn/Player.aspx?enrollmentid=2271604, (slides 1-27). Oct. 24, 2011.</p> <p>Kersten, T. A., & Israel, M. S. (2005). Teacher evaluation: Principal's insights and suggestions for improvement. <i>Planning and Changing</i>, 36(1&2), 47-67.</p> <p>Abshire, S. (2011) Cyberlaw update adapted from presentation to NASSB. Video retrieved from: http://lamar.adobeconnect.com/p2c1lu7d7zp/, October 28, 2011.</p> <p>Texas Long Range Plan For Technology. Retrieved from: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index2.aspx?id=5082&menu_id=2147483665, Nov. 5, 2011.</p> <p>Hopson, M. (2011), <i>Week 1: Establishment and Control of Schools: Part 3: Free Appropriate Public Education</i> retrieved from : https://lamar.epiclms.net/Learn/Player.aspx?enrollmentid=2271604, (slides 17-19). Oct. 24, 2011.</p>
--	--